



KEVIN M. FARRELL, PIERCE ATWOOD  
ONE NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE  
SUITE 350  
PORTSMOUTH, NH 03801

COPY MAILED

APR 06 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of  
Howard Milne Chandler  
Application No. 09/765,217  
Filed: January 18, 2001  
Attorney Docket No. 0141-2005

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition, filed March 31, 2005, which is being treated under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(2) to withdraw the above-identified application from issue after payment of the issue fee. This is also a decision on the petition, filed March 31, 2005, under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), requesting acceptance of an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 for the benefit of the prior-filed nonprovisional Application No. 08/944,858, filed October 6, 1997, as set forth in the amendment filed concurrently with the instant petition.

The petitions are **GRANTED**.

Discussion of Petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(2)

The above-identified application is withdrawn from issue for consideration of a submission under 37 CFR 1.114 (request for continued examination). See 37 CFR 1.313(c)(2).

**Petitioner is advised that the issue fee paid on March 11, 2005 in the above-identified application cannot be refunded. If, however, the above-identified application is again allowed, petitioner may request that it be applied towards the issue fee required by the new Notice of Allowance.<sup>1</sup>**

Discussion of Petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) is only applicable to

---

<sup>1</sup> The request to apply the issue fee to the new Notice may be satisfied by completing and returning the new Issue Fee Transmittal Form PTOL-85(b), which includes the following language thereon: "Commissioner for Patents is requested to apply the Issue Fee and Publication Fee (if any) or re-apply any previously paid issue fee to the application identified above." Petitioner is advised that, whether a fee is indicated as being due or not, the Issue Fee Transmittal Form must be completed and timely submitted to avoid abandonment. Note the language in bold text on the first page of the Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due (PTOL-85).

those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant pending application was filed on January 18, 2001, and was pending at the time of filing of the instant petition. A reference to the prior-filed nonprovisional application has been included in an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title, as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(iii).

The instant nonprovisional application was filed after November 29, 2000, and the claim herein for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed nonprovisional application is submitted after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii). Also, the reference to the prior-filed nonprovisional application was submitted during the pendency of the instant nonprovisional application, for which the claim for benefit of priority is sought. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 120. Accordingly, having found that the instant petition for acceptance of an unintentionally delayed claim for the benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 to the prior-filed nonprovisional application satisfies the conditions of 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3), the petition is granted.

**The granting of the petition to accept the delayed benefit claim to the prior-filed application under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) should not be construed as meaning that the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the prior-filed application. In order for the instant application to be entitled to the benefit of the prior-filed application, all other requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(1) and (a)(2) must be met. Similarly, the fact that the corrected Filing Receipt accompanying this decision on petition includes the prior-filed application should not be construed as meaning that applicants are entitled to the claim for benefit of priority to the prior-filed application noted thereon. Accordingly, the examiner will, in due course, consider this benefit claim and determine whether the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date.**

A corrected Filing Receipt, which includes the priority claim to the prior-filed nonprovisional application, accompanies this decision on petition.

After this decision is mailed, deposit account No. 50-0282 will be charged a total of \$1,895.00 – \$130 for the petition to withdraw from issue, \$1,370.00 for an unintentionally delayed claim for priority and \$395 for the RCE.

Any inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to Wan Laymon at (571) 272-3220.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 1641 for appropriate action on the amendment filed March 31, 2005, including consideration by the examiner of applicants' entitlement to claim benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 to the prior-filed nonprovisional application.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Frances Hicks".

Frances Hicks  
Lead Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

**ATTACHMENT:** Corrected Filing Receipt

---